

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed April 13, 2009. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 21-51 remain pending as amended above.

35 USC §§101 and 112 Rejection of the Claims

It is believed that the above-detailed amendments to claims 21 and 47-48 fully address the rejections under 35 USC §§101 and 112. In particular, claim 21 now recites logic “circuitry”. Also, the occurrence of “third logic” in claims 47-47 has been replaced with “memory” which finds antecedent basis.

35 USC §102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 21-22, 25, 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Karr et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20070005152).

Claims 21, 24, 26-42, 44-51 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jahagirdar et al. (U.S. Publication No. 20070001694).

Claims 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Jacobson (U.S. Publication No. 20060221527).

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed since the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to in part recite the language of allowable claim.

As indicated by the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, clearly fail to teach or even suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 1, including for example, the claimed one or more voltage values are to comprise a current value of a threshold voltage and a current value of a supply voltage.

The remaining independent claims recite similar (though not identical) language and have been rejected for similar reasons as claim 1. Hence, these remaining independent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 1, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art. With respect to independent claims 21 ad 39, please note that these claims already recite language similar to claims 41 and 42. Amendments to claim 39 are based on language of claim 43 and claim 43 has been amended to provide antecedent basis.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303-800-6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee (in the form of credit card charge), to obtain a one-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from July 13, 2009, to August 13, 2009.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890

Telephone Number: 303-800-6678

Date August 13, 2009

By /Ramin Aghevli – Reg. No. 43,462/
Ramin Aghevli
Reg. No. 43,462